39. (New) The method of claim 38, wherein the conductive element is sphere.

40. (New) The method of claim 38, wherein the entire conductive element becomes embedded within the laminate.

REMARKS

Claims 21-24 and 27-40 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 21, 27, 36 and 37 have been amended and new claims 38-40 have been added. Reconsideration and allowance in view of the amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action dated November 7, 2002, the Examiner rejected claims 21-24 and 27-37 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Watanabe et al. (US 5,319,159, hereinafter "Watanabe").

Applicants respectfully traverse the 102(b) rejections with the following arguments.

35 USC 102(b)

The Examiner alleges that "Watanabe discloses a structure and method of forming a conductive path (2) within a laminate (3) as shown in figures 1-2 comprising: a conductive element (6-figure 1c, column 3, line 66, and 9-figure 1f, column 4, line 17) embedded into an opening (through hole-4, column 3, line 56) of a laminate (3), the conductive element (6, 9) is press(ed) [sic] into the opening (4) of the laminate, wherein a portion of the conductive element (6, 9) formed at least one contact pad (copper plating layer 6-see figures 1d-1f) extending beyond a surface of the laminate (3), wherein the conductive element includes an inner element (9)

covered by an outer element (6)."

Applicants respectfully contend that claims 21 and 36 are not unpatentable over Watanabe because Watanabe does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 21 and 36. For example, Watanabe does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, the steps comprising: pressing a conductive element into the opening of a laminate such that a portion of at least one end of the conductive element extends beyond a surface of the laminate, and applying a compressive pressure to the at least one end of the conductive element, whereby the compressive pressure applied to the at least one end of the conductive element forms a contact pad extending beyond the surface of the laminate, as recited in claims 21 and 36.

In contrast, layers 6 and 9 that the Examiner considers the conductive element are formed by plating and screen printing processes, respectively. (See, col. 3, ln. 62- col. 4, ln. 12). Layers 6 and 9 are not **pressed** into the opening 4 of the baseplate 1, as required by claims 21 and 36 of the present invention. Furthermore, the portion of layer 6 that the Examiner contends is "extending beyond a surface of the laminate", as shown in figure 1f, is formed on the surface of the baseplate 1 as a result of the plating process mentioned above, and not as a result of the application of a **compressive pressure**, as required in claims 21 and 36.

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 27 is not unpatentable over Watanabe because Watanabe does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 27. For example, Watanabe does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a laminate having a conductive inner plane, and a conductive element embedded into the laminate wherein the conductive element electrically connects the conductive inner plane to an outer surface of the laminate, as required in claim 27.

Applicants refer the Examiner to figures 1a-1i where it is clear, there is no conductive

inner plane disclosed in Watanabe.

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 37 is not unpatentable over Watanabe because Watanabe does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 37. For example, Watanabe does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a first laminate having a first conductive element embedded into the first laminate wherein a portion of the first conductive element forms at least one contact pad extending beyond a surface of the first laminate; a second laminate having a second conductive element embedded into the second laminate wherein a portion of the second conductive element forms at least one contact pad extending beyond a surface of the second laminate; and a bonding layer between the first and second laminates, whereby the contact pads of the first and second conductive elements are electrically connected, as recited in claim 37.

Again, Applicants refer the Examiner to figures 1a-1i where it is clear, there is no teaching of multiple laminates having a bonding layer therebetween in Watanabe, as required in claim 37.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the entire application is in condition for allowance. However, should the Examiner believe anything further is necessary in order to place the application in better condition for allowance, or if the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would be advantageous to resolve the issues presented, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Jack P. Friedman
Reg. No. 44,688

Date: 04/22/2003

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, NY 12110
(518)220-1850